ENTERED received

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

DEC 1 4 2017

AT BALTIMORE CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

DEPUTY

EDWARD LEE,

Movant

CRIMINAL NO. JKB-13-0133

CIVIL NO. JKB-16-2008

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent

MEMORANDUM

Pending before the Court is Edward Lee's motion to vacate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. (Crim. No. 13-0133, ECF No. 93.) The motion is premised upon the Supreme Court's ruling in Johnson v. United States, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015), which held that the residual clause of the Armed Career Criminal Act ("ACCA") was void for vagueness. Id. at 894. Movant asserts an entitlement to relief because the sentencing court determined Movant was a career offender under the advisory sentencing guidelines and those guidelines included a career offender provision with wording identical to the ACCA provision struck down in Johnson as unconstitutionally vague. The Supreme Court's more recent decision in Beckles v. United States, 137 S. Ct. 886 (2017), held that the sentencing guidelines may not be challenged as void for vagueness. Id. at 894. Accordingly, the instant motion is without merit and will be denied by separate order.

A certificate of appealability may issue only if the movant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). See also Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). In order to satisfy § 2253(c), a movant must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003) (citing Slack, 529 U.S. at 484). Lee has failed to make such a showing, and the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

DATED this ______ day of December, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

James K. Budan

James K. Bredar

Chief Judge